

**REMARKS:**

The examiner has rejected claims 16 through 20 and 22 through 29 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Sala '238. Claims 21 and 30 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sala '238.

In responding to these rejections, the applicant has amended independent method claim 28 to specify that the contact surface of the optics carrier is displaced on the bearing surface of the retaining frame until a target position of the optics element relative to the image sensor has been reached. Moreover, independent device claim 16 has been amended to include means plus function language corresponding to method steps a) and b) of claim 28. Claim 17 has been amended to delimit the pretensioning means as a portion of the facilitating means now recited in claim 16. The applicant believes that the invention as amended is distinguished from the Sala reference for the following reasons.

In rejecting claims 28 and claim 16 over Sala with regard to recitations of displacing the contact surface of the optics carrier on the bearing surface of the retaining frame to achieve a target position, the examiner refers to column 5, lines 8 through 13 of Sala. However, this portion of the Sala reference concerns displacement of the focus of the video camera and states that the focus can be shifted or adjusted through telescoping the housing of lens 34. This telescoping action of lens 34 leads to a displacement of lens 34 relative to the image sensor of Sala in a **longitudinal** direction. In contrast thereto, claims 16 and 28 as amended clearly require the adjustment of the optics element relative to the image sensor to be in a **transverse** direction, since the bearing surface is substantially parallel to the plane of the image sensor. The

invention is therefore related to a lateral adjustment of the optics element relative to the image sensor, whereas Sala is directed to an axial adjustment of the position and consequently the focus of the optics element relative to the imaging sensor. Sala therefore provides no motivation for displacement in a transverse direction necessitated by the claim language as amended.

The invention as claimed provides for a straightforward method for mounting the optics element relative to the imaging sensor which subsequently permits adjustment of the transverse orientation and alignment of these two elements with respect to each other while facilitating subsequent permanent attachment at the aligned position. The prior art of record provides no suggestion for these limitations or for the associated elements required for their enactment. The invention is therefore sufficiently distinguished from that prior art to satisfy the requirements of both 35 USC 102 as well as 35 USC 103. Reconsideration and passage to issuance is therefore requested.

No new matter has been added in this amendment.

Respectfully submitted

Paul Vincent

Dr. Paul Vincent  
Reg. No. 37,461

July 1, 2009

Date

Dreiss Patentanwälte  
Postfach 10 37 62  
D-70032 Stuttgart, Germany  
Telephone +49-711-24 89 38-0  
Fax +49-711-24 89 38-99